

0601142

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/6/2006 6:01:49 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

REC-10
MAY 8 2006
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20541

DATE: May 6, 2006 5:40 PM
NAME: Bob Gutzmer
ADDR1: 3424 E. 21st ave
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Lake station
STATE: Indiana
ZIF: 46405-1108
PHONE:
EMAIL: ReGutzmer@hotmail.com
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Bob Gutzmer
3424 E. 21st ave
Lake station, Indiana 46405-1108
CC:
FCC General Email Box

AS OF 05/06/2006 073
Jst:ABCDE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/7/2006 3:31:32 AM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 7, 2006 03:10 AM
NAME: David Bowers
ADDR1: 2419 Spring St.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Portage
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46368-2270
PHONE:
EMAIL: tutti48@msn.com
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0C01

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

David Bowers
2419 Spring St.
Portage, Indiana 46368
cc:
FCC General Email Box

cc: Copied to
MABODE

043

0601148

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/5/2006 1:02:48 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

REC-1000

MAY 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20541

DATE: May 5, 2006 1:02 PM
NAME: craig rothman
ADDR1: 324 jefferson ave.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: chesterton
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46304-3235
PHONE:
EMAIL: cccres@aol.com
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

craig rothman
324 jefferson ave.
chesterton, Indiana 46304
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

083

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/5/2006 10:32:51 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 5, 2006 10:11 AM
NAME: Dawn Platt
ADDR1: 8007 Duluth St
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Highland
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46322-1312
PHONE:
EMAIL: plattville@sbcglobal.net
msg:

REC-1
MAY 2 2006
Federal Communications Commission
CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

I am writing you to express a serious concern I have with a proposal in front of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). FCC Chairman Kevin Martin would like to change the collection system for the Universal Service Fund (USF) in a way that would increase my monthly phone bill. I pay my fair share of taxes and I'm upset that a plan asking me - and millions of Americans - to pay more than our fair share is even a consideration.

If you shift the Universal Service Fund collection method to a flat-fee, those of us who use little or no long distance are really going to suffer. Some of us will be paying up to 1000% more each month than we do today. Public data proves that the current USF collection method is stable and not in a funding crisis - at \$7.1 billion I feel that the USF is big enough. There is no reason to switch to a flat-fee system that burdens those it was created to help while offering tax breaks to big businesses and high volume users.

I ask for your assistance in letting the FCC and Chairman Martin know how much this flat-fee proposal would hurt your constituents. There are other ways to make the USF system work without saddling MILLIONS of Americans with a tax increase we don't deserve. Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Dawn Platt
8007 Duluth St
Highland, Indiana 46322-1312

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 3
List A B C D E

0661146

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/4/2006 9:33:49 PM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

REC'D

MAY 2 4 2006

Federal Communications Commission

DATE: May 4, 2006 9:29 PM
NAME: K MOLNAR
ADDR1: 2709 Capri Dr
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Schererville
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46375-2465
PHONE:
EMAIL: tomkatmo@sbcglobal.net
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

K MOLNAR
2709 Capri Dr
Schererville, Indiana 46375
cc:
FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 043
List A B C D E

0601148

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/4/2006 5:04:18 PM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 4, 2006 4:42 PM
NAME: Mary Anne Koehler
ADDR1: 211 Beacon DR
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Hobart
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46342-2821
PHONE:
EMAIL: mkoehler@steelworkers-usw.org
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

I am writing you to express a serious concern I have with a proposal in front of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). FCC Chairman Kevin Martin would like to change the collection system for the Universal Service Fund (USF) in a way that would increase my monthly phone bill. I pay my fair share of taxes and I'm upset that a plan asking me - and millions of Americans - to pay more than our fair share is even a consideration.

If you shift the Universal Service Fund collection method to a flat-fee, those of us who use little or no long distance are really going to suffer. Some of us will be paying up to 1000% more each month than we do today. Public data proves that the current USF collection method is stable and not in a funding crisis - at \$7.1 billion I feel that the USF is big enough. There is no reason to switch to a flat-fee system that burdens those it was created to help while offering tax breaks to big businesses and high volume users.

I ask for your assistance in letting the FCC and Chairman Martin know how much this flat- fee proposal would hurt your constituents. There are other ways to make the USF system work without saddling MILLIONS of Americans with a tax increase we don't deserve. Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary Anne Koehler
211 Beacon DR
Hobart, Indiana 46342

No. of Copies rec'd 043
List A B C D E

960/1149

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/5/2006 12:02:35 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED

MAY 2 1 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of General Counsel

DATE: May 4, 2006 11:51 PM
NAME: William Dillard
ADDR1: 2942 glenwood st
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: portage
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46368-3412
PHONE:
EMAIL: william_dillard@comcast.net
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

I am writing you to express a serious concern I have with a proposal in front of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). FCC Chairman Kevin Martin would like to change the collection system for the Universal Service Fund (USF) in a way that would increase my monthly phone bill. I pay my fair share of taxes and I'm upset that a plan asking me - and millions of Americans - to pay more than our fair share is even a consideration.

If you shift the Universal Service Fund collection method to a flat-fee, those of us who use little or no long distance are really going to suffer. Some of us will be paying up to 1000% more each month than we do today. Public data proves that the current USF collection method is stable and not in a funding crisis - at \$7.1 billion I feel that the USF is big enough. There is no reason to switch to a flat-fee system that burdens those it was created to help while offering tax breaks to big businesses and high volume users.

I ask for your assistance in letting the FCC and Chairman Martin know how much this flat-fee proposal would hurt your constituents. There are other ways to make the USF system work without saddling MILLIONS of Americans with a tax increase we don't deserve. Thank you for your continued work and I look forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

William Dillard
2942 glenwood st
portage, Indiana 46368-3412

No. of Copies rec'd 0+3
List ABCDE

060 1140

RECEIVED

MAY 2 4 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/9/2006 1:01:59 AM
To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 9, 2006 00:40 AM
NAME: Walter Dunivan
ADDR1: 302 Erie St.
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Valparaiso
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46383-4849
PHONE:
EMAIL: wd_ae@yahoo.com
msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Walter Dunivan
302 Erie St.
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383
cc:
FCC General Email Box

... of Copies rec'd 053
ABCODE

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
 Date: 5/6/2006 11:01:55 AM
 To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
 Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DATE: May 6, 2006 10:41 AM
 NAME: Flora Cavinder
 ADDR1: 18100 n 400 w
 ADDR2:
 ADDR3:
 CITY: Wheatfield
 STATE: Indiana
 ZIP: 46392-8942
 PHONE:
 EMAIL: seniorchick@myway.com
 msg:

CC. 06-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
 U.S. House of Representatives
 2256 Rayburn House Office Building
 Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Flora Cavinder
 18100 n 400 w
 Wheatfield, Indiana 46392
 cc:
 FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 0+3
 List ABCDE

0601137

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
Date: 5/9/2006 2:01:36 AM
To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 9, 2006 01:40 AM
NAME: Ashley Gordon
ADDR1: 1009 Merrillville Rd
ADDR2:
ADDR3:
CITY: Crown Pt
STATE: Indiana
ZIP: 46307-2701
PHONE:
EMAIL: cloud9farms@yahoo.com
msg:

CC: 96-45

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
U.S. House of Representatives
2256 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

Please read the bottom of this letter- which is personally from me.

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter. I would like to add that I am a single Mom and a student and I only use my wireless phone when I absolutely need it. Raising taxes will hurt me personally because it is all I can do to afford it now. I work, go to school and raise a child on my own- that is enough. Please consider this in your decision making- go after all these dead beat Dads in the world that don't help us with our kids instead of passing things that hurt those of us

RECEIVED
MAY 24 2006
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

043

trying to make it in this world. Thanks for your consideration

Sincerely,

Ashley Gordon
1009 Merrillville Rd
Crown Pt, Indiana 46307
cc:
FCC General Email Box

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
 Date: 5/10/2006 10:32:35 AM
 To: IN011MA@mail.house.gov
 Subject: WriteRep Responses

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DATE: May 10, 2006 10:10 AM
 NAME: ed wills
 ADDR1: pob 5554
 ADDR2:
 ADDR3:
 CITY: lake station
 STATE: Indiana
 ZIP: 46405-0554
 PHONE:
 EMAIL: dopehigh@excite.com
 msg:

CC: 96-45

Representative Pete Visclosky
 U.S. House of Representatives
 2256 Rayburn House Office Building
 Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

ed wills
 pob 5554
 lake station, Indiana 46405
 cc:
 FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd 043
 List A B C D E

From: "Write your representative" <writerep@heoc-www6.house.gov>
 Date: 5/9/2006 6:03:10 PM
 To: IN01IMA@mail.house.gov
 Subject: WriteRep Responses

DATE: May 9, 2006 5:40 PM
 NAME: Elizabeth Carr
 ADDR1: 628 N. Weston St.
 ADDR2:
 ADDR3:
 CITY: Rensselaer
 STATE: Indiana
 ZIP: 47978-2257
 PHONE:
 EMAIL: bcarr3778@yahoo.com
 msg:

CC: 96-45

RECEIVED
 MAY 24 2006
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Representative Pete Visclosky
 U.S. House of Representatives
 2256 Rayburn House Office Building
 Washington, DC 20515-0001

Dear Representative Visclosky,

As someone who is concerned about increased taxes and telephone fees, I oppose Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Chairman Kevin J. Martin's plans to change the way monies are collected for the Universal Service Fund.

Chairman Martin is proposing a change in the Universal Service Fund (USF) collection methodology from a "pay-for-what-you-use" system to a "monthly flat-fee." The flat-fee system would result in forced phone bill hikes for me -- and for millions of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S. Shifting the funding burden of the USF away from high volume users -- like big businesses -- and placing the weight on low-volume users -- students, prepaid wireless users, senior citizens and low-income residential and rural consumers-- is unfair. I urge Chairman Martin to rethink his flat-fee plan. It is a de-facto tax increase of as much as \$707 million for 43 million of low-volume, long-distance users in the U.S.

Please pass along my concerns to the FCC on my behalf, letting them know that your constituents have contacted you to oppose a USF numbers or flat-fee plan. Thank you for your continued work. I look forward to hearing about your position on this matter.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Carr
 628 N. Weston St.
 Rensselaer, Indiana 47978
 CC:
 FCC General Email Box

No. of Copies rec'd
 List ABCDE

0+3